UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,611	01/11/2002	Pamela Szabo	54357-003USPT	9481

7590 06/16/2005	**EXAMINER**
Magaret A. Boulware	CHAVIS, JOHN Q
Jenkens & Gilchrist	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2191	—

Magaret A. Boulware
Jenkens & Gilchrist
A Professional Corporation
1100 Louisiana, Suite 1800
Houston, TX 77002

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary	10/044,611	SZABO ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	John Chavis	2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 December 2004</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-45</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-6,8-20,22-30,32-39 and 41-45</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>7,21,31 and 40</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1.   The newly corrected drawing, fig. 6, has been approved by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims 1-6, 8-20, 22-30, 32-39, and 41-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

as being anticipated by Brodsky et al. (5,991,536).

claims:	Brodsky
1. A computerized method of managing an integrity of an integrated applications environment, comprising the steps of:	See the title and the abstract.
detecting a change in a component of said integrated applications environment;	See again the abstract.
identifying one or more additional components of said integrated applications environment that are affected by said change; and	See col. 1 line 61-col. 2 line 4.
notifying one or more responsible parties for each application using a component affected by said change.	See col. 3 lines 56-63.
2. The method according to claim 1, further comprising implementing said change in said integrated applications environment based upon feedback from said responsible parties.	See col. 2 lines 40-47 in which the validation is considered to provided feedback.
3. The method according to claim 2, further comprising repeating said detecting, identifying, and notifying steps for each additional change to a	See col. 4 lines 24-43.

component of said integrated
applications environment.

4. The method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of logging an information associated with said change.	See col. 4 lines 44-60 in which the " status " information is considered to have been logged.
5. The method according to claim 1, wherein said components of said integrated applications environment include data sources, data destinations, data templates, data maps, data schedules, conversion formulas, filters, and business rules.	See col. 5 lines 51-col. 5 line 6, in which rules are utilized to synchronize changes and filters are utilized to ensure that the appropriate objects are notified. The other features are considered inherent to a notification Manager to ensure that specific objects are notified. Also, see col. 6 line 55-col. 7 line 4.
6. The method according to claim 1, wherein said components of said integrated applications environment are composed of metadata, and said step of detecting includes comparing an old set of metadata with a new set of metadata.	See the Notification Class Manager Definition in col. 5 lines 14-50.
8. The method according to claim 1, further comprising previewing a list of affected components and responsible parties to be notified.	See col. 5 lines 7-13.
9. The method according to claim 1, wherein said detecting step further includes detecting a change in an application.	See again claim 1.
10. The method according to claim 1, wherein said detecting step further includes detecting a change in a business process.	See col. 5 lines 45-50.
11. The method according to claim 1, wherein said integrated applications environment is an enterprise application integration environment.	See again col. 5 lines 45-50.
12. The method according to claim 1, wherein said step of notifying includes notifying a responsible party only when said one or more other components are affected in a predefined manner.	See the rejection of claim 1.
13. The method according to claim 1, wherein said step of notifying includes sending an email notification.	See the rejection of claim 1.

In reference to claims 14-16, see the rejection of claims 1-3 above and

Brodskys claim 1.

The features of claim 17 are taught via claim 1.

As per claims 18-20, see claims 4-6.

Claim 22 is taught via claim 8.

In reference to claims 23-24, see the rejection of claims 12-13.

The features of claims 25-27 are taught by claims 9-11.

As per claim 28, see the rejections of claims 3-4.

Claims 29-30 and 32-34 are rejected as claims 5-6 and 8-10.

In reference to claims 35-36, see the rejection of claims 12-13.

As per claim 37 see the rejections of claims 3-4 and 14.

Claims 38-39 are taught via claim 5-6.

In reference to claim 41, see the rejection of claims 8.

The features of claims 42-43 are taught by claims 12-13.

As per claims 44-45 see the rejections of claims 9-10.

Allowable Subject Matter

4.   Claims 7, 21, 31, and 40 and are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected

base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to John Chavis whose telephone number is (703) 305-

9665. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (703) 305-9662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jqc

John Chavis
Primary Examiner AU-2191